

REMARKS

Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, and entry of this paper is respectfully requested. Moreover, the applicants have reviewed the Final Office Action of October 29, 2003, and submit that this paper is responsive to all points raised therein.

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Weber (U.S. Patent No. 3,670,413).

Claims 9 and 12 have been discussed in the applicant's Amendment of August 20, 2003. Those discussions are applicable here.

Claim 9 has been amended editorially for purposes of clarity. It is respectfully asserted that these amendments address formalities only and are not substantive. Claim 12 remains as previously amended in the Applicants' Amendment of August 20, 2003.

Claim 9 includes a receiver having flexible members that move inward and outward, to allow for attachment of the receiver to a stub. The flexible members have engaging portions, for engaging the stub, in communication with ends. These engaging portions and ends are separate structures on the flexible members in an operative relationship to each other, such that when pressure is applied to the ends, the engaging portions will move outward, allowing for the receiver to be separated from the stub.

Similarly, claim 12 also recites a receiver including flexible members for moving between outward and inward positions. The flexible members include first portions configured for moving between the outward and inward positions, and second portions, in communication with the first portions, these second portions configured such that pressure thereon moves the

first portions to the outward position. Accordingly, like claim 9, the first portions and the second portions of the flexible members are separate structures in an operative relationship to each other.

Weber teaches the spring clips 13 that include ends (as referenced by the Examiner at page 4 of the Final Office Action). The spring clips 13 also include inwardly curved portions of the spring clips 13, these inwardly curved portions serving to facilitate engagement of the receiver to the hub 14, by seating in the annular groove 19 over the cylindrical portion 20.

Weber is in contrast to the structure recited in claims 9 and 12. This is because the ends and inwardly curved portions of the spring clips 13 are the same structure, and not in any way in an operative relationship with each other.

Based on the above, Weber's spring clips 13 do not show the structure of the flexible members, recited in claims 9 and 12. Accordingly, claims 9 and 12 are not anticipated by Weber under 35 USC 102(b).

Moreover, since the flexible members of claims 9 and 12 operate in a completely different manner than the spring clips 13 of Weber, it is respectfully asserted that Weber can not render claims 9 and 12 obvious under 35 USC 103.

Since claims 9 and 12 are neither anticipated by Weber under 35 USC 102(b), nor obvious in view of Weber under 35 USC 103, claims 10 and 11, and 13, respectively dependent thereon, are also allowable over this cited art for the same reasons. These claims further distinguish the invention from this cited art.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this paper, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Entry of this paper and allowance of all pending claims, 9-13, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

POLSINELLI, SHALTON & WELTE

Date: 3 May 2004



Jerome R. Smith, Jr., Reg. No. 35,684
700 West 47th Street, Ste. 1000
Kansas City, MO 64112
Tel: (816) 360-4119
Fax: (816) 753-1536
Attorney for Applicants